

Commissioner for Patents United States Patent and Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 Www.uspto.gov

JJGJ	R.:	06-	00

Paper	No	:

LITMAN LAW OFFICES, LTD PO BOX 15035 CRYSTAL CITY STATION ARLINGTON VA 22215 COPY MAILED

JUN 1 2 2006

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of

Stafford :

DECISION

Application No.: 10/764,445 Filing Date: 27 January, 2004

Attorney Docket No. 12713.01

This is a decision on the petition filed on 5 December, 2005, to revive the instant application under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) as having as abandoned due to unintentional delay.

For the reasons set forth below the petition as considered under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is **DISMISSED**.

NOTES:

- (1) Any petition (and fee) for reconsideration of this decision <u>must</u> be submitted within <u>two</u> (2) <u>months</u> from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) are permitted. The reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b)."
- (2) Thereafter, there will be no further reconsideration of this matter.

BACKGROUND

The record reflects that:

Application No.: 10/764,445

• Petitioner failed to reply timely and properly to the non-final Office action mailed on 3 September, 2004, with reply due absent extension of time on or before 3 December, 2004;

- the application went abandoned by operation of law after midnight 3 December, 2004;
- the Office mailed the Notice of Abandonment on 10 May, 2005;
- with the instant petition (with fee), Petitioner filed a reply in the form of an amendment, but made neither a statement nor showing of unintentional delay—and appeared to use the former one-year time limit on petitions to revive as an unpaid extension of time, which is not permitted, *inter alia*, because such would constitute an intentional delay.

STATUTES, REGULATIONS AND ANALYSIS

Congress has authorized the Commissioner to "revive an application if the delay is shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner to have been "unavoidable." 35 U.S.C. §133 (1994).

The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) and (b) set forth the requirements for a petitioner to revive a previously unavoidably or unintentionally, respectively, abandoned application under this congressional grant of authority. The language of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) is clear, unambiguous, and without qualification: the delay in tendering the reply to the outstanding Office action, as well as filing the first petition seeking revival, must have been unavoidable for the reply now to be accepted on petition.²

Delays in responding properly raise the question whether delays are unavoidable.³ Where there is a question whether the delay was unavoidable, Petitioners must meet the burden of establishing that the delay was unavoidable within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a).⁴

¹ 35 U.S.C. §133 provides:

³⁵ U.S.C. §133 Time for prosecuting application.

Upon failure of the applicant to prosecute the application within six months after any action therein, of which notice has been given or mailed to the applicant, or within such shorter time, not less than thirty days, as fixed by the Commissioner in such action, the application shall be regarded as abandoned by the parties thereto, unless it be shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that such delay was unavoidable.

Therefore, by example, an <u>unavoidable</u> delay in the payment of the Filing Fee might occur if a reply is shipped by the US Postal Service, but due to catastrophic accident, the delivery is not made.

³ See: Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice, 62 Fed. Reg. at 53158-59 (October 10, 1997), 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 86-87 (October 21, 1997).

⁴ See: In re Application of G, 11 USPQ2d 1378, 1380 (Comm'r Pats. 1989).

Application No.: 10/764,445

And the Petitioner must be diligent in attending to the matter.⁵ Failure to do so does not constitute the care required under <u>Pratt</u>, and so cannot satisfy the test for diligence and due care.

(By contrast, <u>unintentional</u> delays are those that do not satisfy the very strict statutory and regulatory requirements of unavoidable delay, <u>and</u> also, by definition, are not intentional.⁶))

Allegations as to Unintentional Delay

The requirements for a grantable petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) are the petition and fee, a statement/showing of unintentional delay, a proper reply, and—where appropriate—a terminal disclaimer and fee if the application was filed before 8 June, 1995.

It appears as of this writing that Petitioner has yet to satisfy the "statement/showing" requirement under the regulation. (Petitioner may review the commentary set forth at MPEP §711.03(c) and the language at 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) for guidance.)

CONCLUSION

The petition as considered under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is dismissed.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:⁷

By mail:

Commissioner for Patents⁸ P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

⁵ See: Diligence in Filing Petitions to Revive and Petitions to Withdraw the Holding of Abandonment, 1124 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 33 (March 19, 1991). It was and is Petitioner's burden to exercise diligence in seeking either to have the holding of abandonment withdrawn or the application revived. See 1124 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office supra.

Therefore, by example, an <u>unintentional</u> delay in the reply might occur if the reply and transmittal form are <u>to be</u> prepared for shipment by the US Postal Service, but other pressing matters distract one's attention and the mail is not timely deposited for shipment.

On July 15, 2005, the Central Facsimile (FAX) Number <u>changed</u> to (571) 273-8300. The number (571) 273-8300 is be the only facsimile number recognized for <u>centralized delivery</u>. (For further information, see: http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/opla/preognotice/cfax062005.pdf.)

⁸ To determine the appropriate addresses for other subject-specific correspondence, refer to the USPTO Web site at www.uspto.gov.

Application No.: 10/764,445

By FAX: IFW Formal Filings

(571) 273-8300

ATTN.: Office of Petitions

By hand: Mail Stop: Petition

Customer Service Window

Randolph Building 401 Dulany Street Alexandria, VA 22314

Telephone inquiries concerning <u>this decision</u> may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3214.

John J. Gillon, Jr. Senior Attorney Office of Petitions